A Juſt Vindication

Of My Earneſt EXPOSTULATION,

Added to my Book, called

The Antichriſts and Sadduces detected, &c.

Directed to the Pious and Learned, in the *Church of England*, and among the *Diſſenters*, againſt the Trifling Exceptions of *Edward Pennington*, which he calls *Some Obſervations*, &c.

PAſſing by his Unchriſtian and Uncharitable Cenſures, of my being guilty of Pride, Ambition, Malice, *&c.* and Monopolizing Knowledge among the Quakers; which laſt he goes to prove, with a lying Story he takes out of a lying Book, publiſhed againſt me, ſaying, 'It ſeems he told a Friend of 'ours in *America*, *If you ſerve* G. K. *ſo*, G. K. *will leave you, and then ye ſhall wander 'about for lack of Knowledge, and ſhall not find it*: Which is an abominable Falſhood: And this and the like falſe Accuſations, are the beſt Armour, theſe my Adverſaries have to Fight againſt me, as alſo his falſly charging me, with impoſing fond Notions, and Unſcriptural Creeds upon them (but what he calls ſo, were no other, then ſome of the great Fundamentals of the Chriſtian Religion, the Denyal whereof I have ſufficiently proved them guilty of, in the Meeting at *Turners-Hall*, 11th. of the 4th. Month, 1696. and in the Printed *Narrative* of the Proceedings there) I think fit to give ſome brief Reply, to his Charge, p. 4, 5. where he ſaith, I once gave a different Character of their Learning and Piety too, to whom I directed that Expoſtulation, for which he citeth ſome Paſſages in a Book of mine, called *Help in time of Need*, Printed above 30 Years ago. But none of theſe Paſſages prove, that I did judge there were none among them all, Pious and Learned, for indeed I was never ſo uncharitable. This Man who will needs print Books, had need to go to School to learn that from Particulars to the Univerſal, the Conſequence is not good. What I ſaid againſt the Philoſophy then taught, in the Colleges of that Nation, many learned and Pious Men in

both

both Nations, will assent to be true, to wit, the Jesuit Philosophy; for that was it which was then taught, and which I learned almost Word by Word out of Jesuit Authors: And since that time, both that College, and I suppose all the other Colleges in both Nations, have changed that sort of Philosophy, out of their dislike to it, as I my self had done, before I was a Quaker. But what if I should blame the Philosophy that is now taught in all the Colleges? Is there no other good Learning, but that called Philosophy? He has but little Learning, that so argues. What I then said against Schools and Universities, was against the ill Constitution and great Abuses in them at that time, but not against Schools, well and duly constituted, as neither was *Luther*, whose Authority I cited against them. Next as to what I said concerning Prelacy, and Lording Bishops, (for so I cautioned it) in that Book. Neither doth this prove, that I did conclude there could be no pious Bishops; for within a few Lines, in that very page, I did own there were some Bishops in Queen *Mary*'s Days, to whom the Lord had a regard, according to their Faithfulness to what they saw; by Lording Bishops, it is obvious, what I meant, even the same that is meant 1 *Pet.* 5. 3. *being Lords over God's Heritage.* But doth this prove, that I did judge there are none to be found Pious and Learned among any here in *England*, Episcopal or others. *Even, Bernard, Thauler,* and *T. Kempis,* with divers others that lived in the Church of *Rome*, many *Protestants* as well as I, have esteemed both Pious and Learned. Indeed I have to my Experience, found such great Lording and Tyrannical Imposition in *George Whitehead*, and *William Penn*, with their Lording Brethren of the Yearly Meeting, 1695. as I never found in any of the Bishops, either *English* or *Scottish*; for by none of them was I ever Excommunicated: but by the Former I was Excommunicated, for bearing my Faithful Testimony against most Vile Errors, opposing the Great Essentials of Christianity, that I found among them. But however, to take away all Shadow of Clamour against me, on the account of any hard or uncharitable Censures I had formerly at any time passed on any of the several Professions of *Protestants*, whether Episcopal or Dissenters of all sorts, or on the account of the hard and uncharitable Names I have at any time given to any of them, that were not deserving them. I have oft by Word of Mouth freely and openly acknowledged my Rashness in so doing, and in my Book of Retractations, shortly to be published, I revoke and retract them All that I have said or writ, or printed at any time against any, that did not deserve the same, though it were easie for me to prove, that they who now thus accuse me, have far exceeded me, in giving hard Names, and passing hard Censures upon the Ministry of all Protestant Professions differing from them. But the thing is so evident, that it were to waste Paper, to prove it, That they have generally called them Thieves, Robbers, Conjurers, Witches, *&c.* But let them own and declare, whether notwithstanding these hard Censures and Names, they have given generally to all Dissenting from them, of All Professions of *Protestants*, do they extend this severe Censure to all and every one of them? Are all and every one of them Witches Conjurers Thieves, Robbers, the Pest of the World, the Bane of Soul and Body of the Universe, Idle Gormandizing Priests, *&c.* the unlovely Epithets they have given Dissenters from them, both *Episcopal* and *Nonconformists*, in general, do they make no exception? Is all *Britain* become such a *Sodom*, that there are not ten Pious or Righteous Persons to be found in it among all the Millions that dissent from them? If they will affirm it is so, their uncharitableness is detestable; but if they will allow, that some Righteous and Pious Persons are to be found among them; then why do they quarrel with me, for allowing the same, and that there are Learned Men among them, far beyond any stock of Learning any of the Quakers lay claim to, I suppose they will not gain-say; what is then my Trespass, for allowing that there are such in the *Church of England*, and among the *Dissenters*, when they do the same?

And

And whereas they say, pag. 6. *Hath he ever retracted this? If not, what encouragement have ye to become his Journey-Men, to work under him?* To the former I say, I have both by Word and Writ, and is designed by me to be in Print very shortly, retracted all the hard Censures and Names that I have at any time given to any, who have not deserved them, as is above-said. But what a base Insinuation is it in them, that I would have any of the Pious and Learned of the several Protestant Professions, to become my Journey-men to work under me? Is there any thing like this in my Expostulation with them? O shameless Men! Have ye no better Weapons to fight against me, but such Lying Insinuations! Let my *Expostulation* be examined, and nothing of that sort will be found. Nay, I have not desired any of their Assistance to defend me (I am content they let me stand or fall to my own Master; for my Trust is, that God will uphold me) but my Expostulation was with them, and my Serious Invitation unto them, by their Pious and Learned Writings, to oppose and refute those Vile Errors, boldly avouched and publickly broached in the late Printed Books of some Leading Men, among a Gang and sort of Quakers.

He saith, *He shall digest the Matter he proposeth to treat upon into ten Heads.* But what indigested matter he brings forth to his and their shame, whom he defends, I think to take some notice. The first Head is my representing the Quakers, as worse than Papists. On this Head he is guilty of gross Untruth and Falshood in two Particulars. 1. That I represent the Quakers as worse than Papists. But the very Words he cites out of my Expostulation clear me, I charge not the Quakers indefinitely, or universally, but a sort and gang of them, if he be such an Idiot to make no distinction betwixt a part and the whole, how is he fit to print Books 2. That he makes me represent them, I so charge, absolutely worse than Papists: Whenas I cautioned my Words thus, —— 'Vile Errors not only as bad as any Popery, but much worse than 'the worst of Popery in DIVERS RESPECTS.. Observe, in *Divers Respects*: I said not absolutely, and in *all respects*, but in *divers respects*. And this I can very easily prove. And as to his Insulting Queries, to answer to some of them; which Answer will comprehend an Answer to them all. *Do we promote Errors*, (saith he) *worse than worshipping a piece of Bread as God?* I say, that's a Transition from the subject of the Controversie betwixt them and me, to another foreign subject, *viz.* Transubstantiation; it seems this bold Novice has not learned that Maxim, *Verba sunt interpretanda secundum subjectam materam*, i. e. Words are to be understood according to the subject matter If I say, this is not one of these respects, wherein I have charged them, this Junior Sophister is at a non-plus. But seeing I have clearly proved that *G. W.* has Destroyed the true Object of the Christian Faith and Worship, by denying Christ to be either God or Man, as I have shewed in my *Narrative*, and, That it is needful to our Salvation, to believe in Christ as he suffered at *Jerusalem*. These mens Error may be justly thought equal to that of the *Papists*, in that very respect, if not to exceed it. The adoring a false Christ within, is fully as great Idolatry, as the *Papists* adoring a piece of Bread without. And it is a false Christ within, which they adore, who set up a false Notion of Light within, and a false Lying Spirit that hath led them to Vilifie and Reproach the Man Christ Jesus without them, and boldly to slight his precious Blood, and call Christ without, glorified in the Heavens, *an imagined God beyond the Stars*, that is denyed by the Light within; therefore that Light within, that denyeth Christ without, who is the true Christians Saviour, and who is both God and Man, is not the true Light, but a Lying Spirit of the Devil. And let sincere Christians judge, whether is the greatest Idolatry, to worship the Devil within, or a piece of Bread without? I am sorry they give me this occasion to detect them; but since they will needs give it, it is fit they be answered. And the same or like Answer will suffice to his Queries, about worshipping Images, Praying to Saints and Angels, Merits and Purgatory: And as to Merits, I am sure most *Papists* are more sound than some of them; for whereas *Papists* generally profess highly to

value Christ's Merits, and own their first Justification to the Merit of Christ's Obedience and Righteousness without them: *William Penn* hath called this Doctrine, *A Doctrine of Devils, and an Arm of the Sea of Corruption, deluging the whole World.* In vain are all his shuffling Aggravations against me, upbraiding me with my being changed in my Opinion, of what these Quakers were: I have owned it again, and again, that I am changed in my Opinion of them; but how doth this prove me an Apostate, or ill man? Are they all ill Men, that have the same Opinion of them as I now have? And as I have formerly told them, they have changed their Opinion of me, as much as I have of them, so that in that respect, they have no advantage against me. I own it, they deceived me, they were the Deceivers and I was the Deceived; and which was worse, let the Intelligent judge. But now I bless God, I am undeceived in them, I know them better: And what would they have more?

The *Second* Head, hath nothing in it worth noticing, but their Unjust charging me with Malice, both with respect to them, *viz.* that Gang of Quakers above-mentioned, and with respect to such whom I directed my *Expostulation* unto, their Application of that place in *Acts* 21. 28. against me, is very Abusive and Shameless. The *Jews* cryed, *Men of Israel, help.* But against what? against *Paul*, and the worthy Name of Christ which he bore Testimony to. Did I make any such Cry, to help against that worthy Name, or any true Professors of it, by my Inviting them to oppose the Vile Errors that are contrary to it? But how doth he prove that I am malicious to the Pious and Learned in the *Church of England*, or among the *Dissenters*? They, and not he, nor his Gang are a fit judge of this. Am I malicious either to the one or the other, to tell them, I would not have the *Papists* out-do them, in Zeal for the Christian Faith? Is it not an evident Argument of my love to them? His base Insinuation, that I would stir up Persecution against them, seeing I had so fairly cautioned against any such Jealousie, both in this *Expostulation*, and in my Printed *Narrative*, I think not worth the least regarding.

The *Third* Head, so far as it contains a false Reflexion on me, I shall not notice, but in so far as it tells a most impudent Untruth, with respect to the People called Quakers, I cannot omit it; for whereas I have said, That many of their chiefest Teachers, have with great boldness provoked such as differed from them, to publick Disputes. This he denyeth to be true: But with what Face of Brass could he deny it? That is a thing so notoriously known, which thousands both of the Church of *England* and Dissenters, can testifie. But the Colour he would put upon it is, That what they did, was to clear themselves, and to detect the Abuses put on them. As if they had been only on the defensive part, in all the publick Oppositions they made in Congregations, and elsewhere; whereas it is abundantly known, they were the first Aggressors, and first of all began to charge all the Ministry in the Nation, with being False Teachers, Hirelings, holding false Doctrines; and though it were to carry Water to the Sea to prove it, yet let but their own Books in Print, particularly *George Fox*'s Journal, and *Edward Bourroughs* collected Treatises, bear witness to any such Novices among the Quakers that know it not. And was *G. F*'s Primmer, to the two Universities, which he himself could not read, and his *Battle dore*, containing Words of many Languages, of which he knew not one Letter, only to clear the People called Quakers.

The *Fourth* Head contains nothing but repeated Recriminations and Reflections against me, already Answered; except that in the latter part of it, they propose it, Whether it would not be most equal and reasonable for them, *viz.* such to whom I have directed my *Expostulation*, to begin with me, by calling me forth to a publick hearing upon my former Books. To this I Answer, that I am most willing they do, and what I cannot justly and safely defend of any passages in my former Books, I will fairly retract. But whereas they upbraid me again, and again, with contradicting my former Doctrines and Principles, as to Articles of Faith, I cannot find that they

have

have proved it against me in one particular. But that they to whom I directed my *Expostulation*, should begin with me, I suppose they will not think so proper, because whatever just Offence I have given to any of them, my late Adversaries of that Gang among the *Quakers* have far exceeded me, and they have that which casts the Ballance as to them, that they justifie all they have said, and printed against them, to every tittle, to maintain their Infallibility; which I have not done, but in divers things I confess my Mistakes, and wherein I have justly offended any, I humbly ask their Forgiveness.

The *Fifth* and *Sixth* Heads, having sufficiently Answered them both in my *Narrative* and *Expostulation*, I see not the least cause to say any thing unto, but leave them to the Readers impartial Consideration. Only I take notice of the bold Untruth he chargeth me with, of my proposing the disturbing of their Meetings; for I cautioned it expresly, that what should be done to refute their Vile Errors, might be done at the end of their Meetings, or at other set times; and this is more regular, than what divers of them have done, to make Opposition in the Meetings of others, before their Meetings were ended, as *Jacob Talner* lately did, in one of our Meetings, who is one of their Preachers: And seeing they justifie what some of them did, by way of publick Opposition, to clear themselves, and to detect the Abuses put on them, and that they allow this to be equal and reasonable, and no trespass against the Civil Peace; and that many, or rather indeed all of other Professions, do judge that the *Quakers* have misrepresented them, and put Abuses on them, why should they not think it fair, that these of other Professions, who think themselves injured by them in point of Doctrine, should have freedom in publick, to their Faces, to clear themselves. And why should not I also by the same Argument, have full Liberty to clear my Innocency, and detect the Abuses they have put upon me, and that Face to Face, without any breach of the Civil Peace? Was the taking away the Preachers Hour-glass with *G. F.* justified, but a clearing themselves? And *Solomon Eccles* coming into a publick Assembly, here in *London*, all besmeared with Mans Excrements, and one that got on the Pulpit, and began to sow and stitch with a Needle?

The *Seventh* Head, is nothing but an unjust Insinuation, That I would excite the Civil Authority against them, and that I would fain instruct the Civil Aurhority, what their Duty is in this Case. But they bringing no Proofs of their Charge against me, it were a superfluous labour in me to Answer them on this Head. I am very hopeful that as formerly I have had the Countenance of some in

Civil

Civil Authority, in my publick Oppoſition to their Vile Errors, ſo I may have the like for the future. Their Inſinuation, *That ſuch Encouragement of any in the Civil Authority, would be a breach of an eſtabliſhed Act of Parliament*, is ſo ſilly and ignorant, that it deſerves not the leaſt Conſideration.

The *Eighth* Head is a bare-faced Calumny, *My high Opinion of my ſelf in ſetting up for Director, both of Church and State, in Methods to be uſed for the preſervation of the Proteſtant Religion.* Doth any honeſt Man, that propoſeth his humble Opinion, what may be good for both the *Proteſtant* Religion, and State of the Kingdom, deſerve ſuch an unworthy Character? Is not the like commonly practiſed from time to time, without the leaſt offence? Had not divers of the Teachers among the *Quakers*, particularly *G. F.* the Younger, given far greater occaſion to be judged, having a high Opinion of himſelf, in what he printed of Adviſe to the King himſelf, viz. *Charles* the Second, and what others have Printed of the like Nature, and what *G. F.* the Elder, and *E. B.* have printed to Parliaments?

In the *Ninth* Head, whereas they charge me, with being either groſly inſincere, or elſe very ignorant of the Law in ſuch Caſes, which deeply affects both Perſons and Eſtates, by Impriſonments, Fines, and Pillory, *viz.* becauſe I ſaid, 'If Order were given by 'them, bearing Authority in this Nation, that all ſuch Books of 'them, as contain Vile and Abominable Errors were ſuppreſſed, they *viz.* my Oppoſers among the *Quakers* ſhould have no Cauſe to complain. To this I Anſwer, 1. Were not by the ſame Argument they inſincere or ignorant, who have charged not only ſome of their Brethren, but differing from them in Punctilio's of their Church-Government and Women's Meetings, as in particular *Chriſtopher Taylor* his charging *William Rogers* with high Blaſphemy, in a Printed Book of his, but alſo in charging with Hereſie and Blaſphemy, many of the Miniſtry in the Nation, reputed Orthodox by Civil Authority? But, 2*dly*, muſt not their Vile Errors and Hereſies be oppoſed, and the Authors of them witneſſed againſt, and Warning given againſt them, otherwiſe all that do ſo, muſt they be reckoned Perſecutors and Malicious. O ye partial Judges, why judge ye ſo partially and inſincerely that in another, wherein ye are ſo guilty your ſelves? If that were any Guiltineſs, to call Error and Hereſie by their true Names.

In their *Tenth*, and laſt Head, they labour to ſtate the Caſe betwixt their Books, and my Books, from *Penſilvania*, as far different: and that my Books were juſtly ſuppreſſed by them, here at *London*, they think it was but common Prudence, to hide the Bone of Contention, leſt my quarrelſom Books, as they are pleaſed to call

call them, ſhould infect ſome with the ſame Spirit of Diſcord. But they plead hard, that their Books ſhould not be ſuppreſt. To this I *Anſwer*, 1. Had it not been more honeſty in them, as well as Chriſtian Prudence, to have diſowned theſe groſs Errors, which I evidently proved againſt them in *Penſilvania*, out of their own Letters and Manuſcripts, as well as by other Proofs, than to have hid and cloaked them, and Excommunicated me, for my faithful oppoſing them. 2. But where is the far different caſe? why they ſhould ſuppreſs my Books, and the Civil Authority ſhould not ſuppreſs theirs? Why? my Books would have been a Bone of Contention, to infect ſome with the ſame Spirit of Diſcord. But muſt not the Truth be contended for? Are we not commanded to *Contend earneſtly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints*? and ſuch was the contention of my Books, and of my Spirit. The caſe indeed, I confeſs, is very different, but to their great diſadvantage, and to my great advantage. They did well, they think, to ſuppreſs my Books, leſt ſome Diſcredit or Reproach ſhould fall on them, if it ſhould be known, that any of them did hold ſuch Principles, which all true *Chriſtians* abhor, being contrary to the Eſſentials of *Chriſtianity*. But their Books muſt have free and full Scope to paſs current through the Nations, that have been a far greater Bone of Contention, and tending not only to bring Infamy upon all other *Chriſtian* Profeſſions and Profeſſors, but Reproach and Contempt upon the Perſon and Doctrine of our bleſſed Saviour, and his holy Prophets and Apoſtles, as not only I, but others have made clearly to appear, and may be yet made more to appear in due time.

His idle Story, about the *Revolutions*, which they have ſo nauſeouſly repeated, and which I have oft fully Anſwered; to anſwer it any more, would be a needleſs Repetition, therefore I let it paſs with his other Impertinencies and Calumnies, not worth the noticing. But were I inclined to retort his idle Story of *Eraſiſtratus* againſt me, on the Hypotheſis of the Revolution, (or Tranſmigration) I might ſay theſe my late Adverſaries, who place all upon the Inward Principle, excluding the Man Chriſt Jeſus from being our Saviour, are the old *Stoicks*, *Epicureans*, *Pelagian Brittains redivive*, and other Ethnick Philoſophers, who bitterly oppoſed the Chriſtian Faith. But though they have not their Souls, I am ſure they have their Heatheniſh, Antichriſtian Principles.

G. K.

THE END.

London, Printed by *J. Bradford*, in *New-ſtreet*, without *Biſhops-gate*, near *Hand-Ally*, 1696